## 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

3.1 Introduction

1. Project title: Masonic Homes of California - Covina Campus

2. Lead agency name and address: City of Covina

Community Development Department

125 East College Street Covina, CA 91723

. Contact person and phone number: Shelby Williams

(626) 858-7231

4. Project location: The proposed site for the proposed residential project is

the Masonic Homes of California - Covina Campus, which is located in the City of Covina, in southeast Los Angeles County, California. The proposed site is bounded by East Old Badillo Street on the north, North Reeder Avenue on the east, Walnut Creek, an intermittent stream on the south, and South Starglen

Drive on the west.

5. Project sponsor's name and address: Masonic Homes of California, Inc.

1650 East Old Badillo Street

Covina, CA 91724

6. General plan designation: Low Density Residential (0-6 units per acre)

7. **Zoning:** Planned Community Development/Multi-Family

Residential-8500 (PCD/RD-8500)

8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

See Section 2.4

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

See Section 2.3

- 10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): Permits expected to be required include:
  - National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit
  - State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) General Permit
  - Tree Preservation Permit from the City of Covina

## **ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by the proposed project. The factors involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" are indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

Aesthetics	Agricultural Resources	Air Quality
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Geology/Soils
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Hydrology/Water Quality	Land Use/Planning
Mineral Resources	Noise	Population/Housing
Public Services	Recreation	Transportation/ Traffic
Utilities/Service Systems	Mandatory Findings of Significance	

DETER	MINATION:					
On the	basis of this initial evaluation:					
	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant e NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	ffect on the environment, and a				
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant ewill not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATION prepared.	project have been made by or				
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	t on the environment and an				
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.					
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant because all the potentially significant effects (1) have been an altenvironmental impact report or negative D applicable legal standards, and (2) have been avoided or mitigenvironmental impact report or negative Declar or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project,	yzed adequately in an earlier ECLARATION pursuant to gated pursuant to that earlier RATION, including revisions				
Signatu	Jeff Kugel	3-20-07 Date				
Signatu	INSIST FILING OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	Date				

d

## 3.2 Completed Checklist

The following IS checklist presents a summary of the potential environmental impacts that could result from development of the Project. Detailed explanations for each of the checklist responses are provided in Section 4.0. Potential sources of impact are categorized under one of four column headings:

- Potentially Significant Impact: A checkmark indicates that there is sufficient evidence that an
  effect would be significant, or that further analysis within an EIR is required to make that
  determination.
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: A checkmark indicates that that it can be reasonably concluded that a potentially significant effect would be avoided or reduced to less than significant through the implementation of one or more mitigation measures, as specified.
- Less Than Significant: A checkmark indicates that it is clear, based upon the project characteristics
  and the affected environment, that the project's impact would be less than significant. No further
  analysis within an EIR is required.
- No Impact: A checkmark indicates that it is clear, based upon the project characteristics and the
  affected environment, that this project would have no effect with respect to the checklist topic in
  question. No further analysis within an EIR is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS—Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				$\square$
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$	
II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES—In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agricultural farmland. Would the project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could individually or cumulatively result in loss of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
III. AIR QUALITY—Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				$   \overline{\mathbf{V}} $
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		$\square$		
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			$\square$	
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				$ \mathbf{\nabla}$
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			V	
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		$\square$		
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		$\square$		
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) either individually or in combination with the known or probable impacts of other activities through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?				
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		$\square$		
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES—Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		V		
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		$   \overline{\mathbf{V}} $		
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$	
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS—Would the project:				
<ul> <li>Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</li> </ul>				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			<b>V</b>	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	님	님		
iv) Landslides?			$   \overline{\square} $	
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	П	Ц	$\checkmark$	Ш
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?			$\square$	
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS—Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?				
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$	
d. Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			V	
h. Expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$	
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY—Would the project:				,
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			V	
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (i.e., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			$\square$	
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			V	
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems to provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?  f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				
g. Place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				
h. Place within a 100-year floodplain structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				$\square$
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				$\square$
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	Ц	Ц	$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$	
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING—Would the project:	_	_		
a. Physically divide an established community?	Ļ	Ш	L	$\checkmark$
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				$\square$
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?				$\checkmark$
X. MINERAL RESOURCES—Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and residents of the state?				$\square$

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than	NY Kanada
	Impact	Incorporated	Significant	No Impact
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				$   \overline{\mathbf{A}} $
XI. NOISE—Would the project result in:				
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			$\square$	
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		$\square$		
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING—Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and business) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			$\square$	
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				

Masonic Homes of California
Coving Campus Expansion

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
Fire protection?		$\overline{\mathbf{Q}}$		
Police protection?				
Schools?		$\square$		
Parks?		$\overline{\square}$		
Other public facilities?		lacksquare		
XIV. RECREATION				*
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on -the environment?				$\square$
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC—Would the project:				
a. Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			V	
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			$\square$	
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?		H		$\overline{\Delta}$
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	Ц	П	$\mathbf{\Lambda}$	Ш
g. Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				V
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?		$\square$		
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			$\square$	
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				Ø
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$	
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			V	
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)		$\square$		
c. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				<b>V</b>